

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 14 stand cancelled and claim 8 has been amended to clarify the features of the invention. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments; support therefor being found throughout the specification and in the original claims of the application.

Claims 8-13 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over art described in the present application at pages 1-3 (referred to hereafter as "AAPA") in view of Engle (US Patent 5,286,232).

The rejection is traversed. The cited art does not teach or suggest the present invention in any manner sufficient to sustain the rejection.

However, while Applicant disagrees with the instant rejection, claim 8 has been amended to further define and clarify the features of the invention. In view of the amendments herein and the remarks presented below, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn.

Referring to Figs. 3-4 of the present application, there are several noteworthy features that distinguish the methods for manufacturing the shaft sleeve structure of the present invention from the art cited.

First, the central segment has an internal diameter **gradually tapered** from the first segment to the second segment **in order to draw the slider out easily from the second segment toward the first segment and increase the accuracy of passage 303**, when the slider is within the optic module 30. Hence, the present invention only needs a very slight taper change - only a minimal draft angle - in passage 303. The angle change is indeed slight and is necessary in order to draw out the slider easily (as shown in Fig. 3).

Second, **the optic module 30 is capable of being slid smoothly along a guiding shaft 33.** Hence, the need for the minimal draft angle.

Referring now to the AAPA, it is noted that the passage of shaft sleeve 21 is formed **without using any draft angle.** Hence, the configuration of the shaft sleeve 21 is not suitable for the supporting base 10 to slide smoothly along the guiding shaft 11.

With regard to Engle, **the internal spline 16 is tightly matched inside the housing 12 with the taper-shape. Hence, the taper shape is used to prevent the internal spline 16 from being moved outside the housing 12.** This is in contrast to Applicant's invention where the taper facilitates the smooth sliding feature.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited art, even in combination, fails to teach or even suggest the methods of the present invention. Accordingly, the rejection is properly withdrawn.

For example, see *In re Marshall*, 198 USPQ 344, 346 (CCPA 1978) ("[r]ejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art.") Additionally, it is well-known that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP § 2143.

There is no suggestion or motivation, either in the art cited or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the cited reference to make the claimed invention, nor is there a reasonable expectation of success.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection are requested.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Christ C. O'Day
Christine C. O'Day

Registration No.: 38,256
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(617) 439-4444
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant